

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother *** therefore, is this distress come upon us.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME I.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1836.

NUMBER 10.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

NEW RICHMOND, CLERMONT CO., OHIO.

Terms.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable IN ADVANCE.

All Letters and Communications must be post-paid—and should be directed to the Editor of the Philanthropist. Names of the Counties particularly should be mentioned in directing where papers are to be sent.

An Advertisement making one square or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for One Dollar.

SLAVE-HOLDER'S DEPARTMENT.

Calhoun's Report, in the Senate, Feb. 4, 1836.

MR CALHOUN made the following report:—

The SELECT COMMITTEE to whom was referred that portion of the President's Message which relates to the attempts to circulate, through the mail, inflammatory appeals, to excite the slaves to insurrection, submitted the following report:—

The committee fully concur with the president, as to the character and tendency of the papers which have been attempted to be circulated in the south, through the mail, and participate with him, in the indignation and regret which he expresses, at conduct so destructive of the peace and harmony of the country, and so repugnant to the constitution and the dictates of humanity and religion. They also concur in the hope, that, if the strong tone of disapprobation which these unconstitutional and wicked attempts have called forth, does not arrest them, the non-slaveholding states will be prompt to exercise their power to suppress them, as far as their authority extends. But, while they agree with the president as to the evil, and its highly dangerous tendency, and the necessity of arresting it, they have not been able to assent to the measure of redress which he recommends—that Congress should pass a law, prohibiting, under severe penalty, the transmission of incendiary publications, through the mail, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection.

After the most careful and deliberate investigation, they have been constrained to adopt the conclusion, that Congress has not the power to pass such a law; that it would be in violation of one of the most sacred provisions of the constitution, and subversive of reserved powers, essential to the preservation of the domestic institutions of the slaveholding states, and with them their peace and security. Concurring, as they do, with the president, in the magnitude of the evil, and the necessity of its suppression, it would have been the cause of deep regret to the committee, if they thought the difference of opinion, as to the right of Congress, would deprive the slaveholding states of any portion of the protection which the measure recommended by the president was intended to afford them. On the contrary, they believe all the protection intended may be afforded, according to the views they take of the power of Congress, without infringing on any provision of the constitution on one side, or the reserved rights of the states on the other.

The committee, with these preliminary remarks, will now proceed to establish the positions which they have assumed, beginning with the first—that the passage of a law would be a violation of an express provision of the constitution.

In the discussion of this point, the committee do not deem it necessary to enquire whether the right to pass such a law can be derived from the power to establish post-offices and post-roads, or from the trust "of preserving the relation created by the constitution between the states," as supposed by the president. However ingenious or plausible the arguments may be, by which it may be attempted to derive the right from these, or any other sources, they must fall short of their object. The jealous spirit of liberty which characterized our ancestors, at the period when the constitution was adopted, forever closed the door by which the right might be implied from any of the granted powers, or any other source, if there be any other. The committee refer to the amended article of the constitution, which, among other things, provides that Congress shall pass no law which shall abridge the liberty of the press—a provision which interposes, as will be hereafter shown, an insuperable objection to the measure recommended by the president. That the true meaning of this provision may be fully comprehended, as bearing on the point under consideration, it will be necessary to recur briefly to the history of the adoption of the constitution.

It is well known that great opposition was made to the adoption of the constitution. It was acknowledged, on all hands, at the time, that the old confederation, from its weakness, had failed, and that something must be done to save the country from anarchy and confusion; yet, so high was the spirit of liberty, so jealous were our ancestors of that day of power, that the utmost efforts were necessary, under all the then existing pressure, to obtain the assent of the states to the ratification of the constitution. Among the many objections to its adoption, none were more successfully urged than the absence of those general provisions which experience had shown to be necessary to guard the outworks of liberty; such as the freedom of the press and of speech, the rights of conscience, of trial by jury, and others of like character. It was the belief of those jealous and watchful guardians of liberty, who viewed the adoption of the constitution with so much apprehension, that all these sacred barriers without some positive provision to protect them, would, by the power of construction, be undermined and prostrated. So strong was this apprehension, that it was impossible to obtain a ratification of the instrument in many of the states, without accompanying it with the recommendation to incorporate in the constitution various articles, as amendments, intended to remove this defect, and guard against the danger apprehended, by placing these important rights beyond the possible encroachment of Congress. One of the most important of these is that which stands at the head of the list of amended articles, and which, among other things, as has been stated, prohibits the passage of any law abridging the freedom of the press, and which left that important barrier against power under the exclusive authority and control of the states.

That it was the object of this provision to place the freedom of the press beyond the possible interference of Congress, is a doctrine not now advanced for the first time. It is the ground taken, and so ably sustained, by Mr. Madison, in his celebrated report to the Virginia legislature, in 1799, against the alien and sedition law, and which conclusively settled the principle that Congress has no right, in any form or in any manner, to interfere with the freedom of the press.* The establishment of this

principle not only overthrew the sedition act, but was the leading cause of the great political revolution which, in 1801, brought the republican party, with Mr. Jefferson at its head, into power.

With these remarks, the committee will turn to the sedition act, in order to show the identity in principle between it and the act which the message recommends to be passed, as far as it relates to the freedom of the press. Among its other provisions, it inflicted punishment on all persons who should publish any false, scandalous, or malicious writing against the government, with intent to defame the same, or bring it into contempt or disrepute. Assuming this provision to be unconstitutional, as abridging the freedom of the press, which no one now doubts, it will not be difficult to show that, if, instead of inflicting punishment for publishing, the act had inflicted punishment for circulating, through the mail, for the same offence, it would have been equally unconstitutional. The one would have abridged the freedom of the press as effectually as the other. The object of publishing is circulation; and to prohibit circulation is, in effect, to prohibit publication. They both have a common object—the communication of sentiments and opinions to the public; and the prohibition of one may as effectually suppress such communication as the prohibition of the other, and, of course, would as effectually interfere with the freedom of the press, and be equally unconstitutional.

But, to understand more fully the extent of the control which the right of prohibiting circulation through the mail would give to the government of the press, it must be borne in mind that the power of Congress over the post-office and the mail is an exclusive power. It must also be remembered that Congress, in the exercise of this power, may declare any road or navigable water to be a post-road; and that, by the act of 1835, it is provided "that no stage, or other vehicle, that regularly performs trips on a post road, or on a road parallel to it, shall carry letters." The same provision extends to packets, boats, or other vessels on navigable waters. Like provision may be extended to newspapers and pamphlets; which, if it be admitted that Congress has a right to discriminate, in reference to their character, what papers shall or shall not be transmitted by mail, would subject the freedom of the press, on all subjects, political, moral, and religious, completely to its will and pleasure. It would, in fact, in some respects, more effectually control the freedom of the press than any sedition law, however severe its penalties. The mandate of the government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of a sedition law, which experience has shown are not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral, or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgement of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1799, had the sedition law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that edictous act was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so imperfect.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the sedition law would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the sedition act was condemned as unconstitutional was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the sedition law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others no less so, derived from the powers reserved to the states, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It, of course, assumes for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question, then, is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding states, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but to admit it would be fatal to those states. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down all the barriers which the slaveholding states have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the states, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those states, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately, Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the states are under the protection of the states themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding states to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary.

prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

sary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly exhibited to the states by the constitution. To establish the truth of this position, so essential to the safety of those states, it would seem sufficient to appeal to their constant exercise of this right, at all times, without restriction or question, both before and since the adoption of the constitution. But, on a point of so much importance, which may involve their safety, if not the existence itself, of an entire section of the union, it will be proper to trace it to its origin, in order to place it on a more immovable foundation.

That the states which form our federal union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate states, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the general government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compact itself expressly provides that all powers not delegated are reserved to the states and the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it be not among them, it belongs, of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the internal peace and security of the states, and, of course, reserves to the states this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a state to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities; and so jealous were the states of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the constitution "that the general government shall not assist a state, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the state itself; thus excluding, by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases."

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding states, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to enquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the general government, and the other states, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that with which the committee are immediately charged, and which, at the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security, belongs to a state, the general government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may admit, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding states having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave, in these states, their right, of course, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of measures, which may be adopted by the states for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations, and between the states, may require co-operation on the part of the general government; and it is bound, in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the states in their exercise, and so to modify its acts as not only not to violate those of the states, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of the 25th of February, 1803, entitled "an act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain states," where, by the laws of those states, their importation is prohibited, masters or captains of ships or vessels are forbidden, under severe penalty, "to import or bring, or cause to be imported or brought, any negro, or mulatto, or person of color, not being a native, or citizen, or registered seaman of the United States, or seamen natives of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope, into any port or place which shall be situated in any state which, by law, has prohibited, or shall prohibit, the admission or importation of such negro, mulatto, or other person of color." This provision speaks for itself, and requires no illustration. It is a case in point, and fully embraces the principle laid down. To the same effect is the act of 25th of February, 1799, respecting quarantine and health laws, which, as belonging to the internal police of the states, stand on the same ground. The act, among other things, "directs the collectors, and all other revenue officers, the masters and crew of the revenue cutters, and the military officers in command on the station, to co-operate faithfully in the execution of the quarantine and other restrictions, which health laws of the state may establish."

The principles embraced by these acts, in relation to the commercial intercourse of the country, are equally applicable to the intercourse by mail. There may, indeed, be more difficulty in co-operating with the states in the latter, than in the former, but that cannot possibly affect the principle. Regarding it, then, as established both by reason and precedents, the committees, in conformity with it, have prepared a bill, and directed their chairman to report the same to the Senate, prohibiting, under the penalty of fine and imprisonment, any deputy, post-master, in any state, territory, or district, from knowingly receiving and putting into the mail, any letter, packet, pamphlet, paper, or pictorial representation, directed to any post-office, or person in a state, territory, or district, by the laws of which the circulation of the same is forbidden; and also prohibiting, under a like penalty, any deputy-post-master in said state, territory, or district, from knowingly delivering the same, except to such persons as may be authorized to receive them by the civil authority of said state, territory, or district.

It remains next to enquire into the duty of the states from within whose limits and jurisdiction the internal peace and security of the slaveholding states are endangered.

In order to comprehend more fully the nature and extent of their duty, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the relations which exist between the states of the federal union, with the rights and obligations reciprocally resulting from such relations.

*See fourth article, fourth section, of the constitution.

It has already been stated that the states which compose our federal union are sovereign and independent communities, united by a constitutional compact. Among its members the laws of nations are in full force and obligation, except as altered or modified by the compact; and of course, the states possess, with that exception, all the rights, and are subject to all the duties, which separate and distinct communities possess, or to which they are subject. Among these are comprehended the obligation which all states are under to prevent their citizens from disturbing the peace or endangering the security of other states; and, in case of being disturbed or endangered, the right of the latter to demand of the former to adopt such measures as will prevent their recurrence, and, if refused or neglected, to resort to such measures as its protection may require. This right remains, of course, in force among the states of this union, with such limitations as are imposed expressly by the constitution. Within their limits, the rights of the slaveholding states are as full to demand of the states within whose limits and jurisdiction their peace is assailed, to adopt measures necessary to prevent the same, and, if refused or neglected, to resort to means to protect themselves, as if they were separate and independent communities.

Those states, on the other hand, are not only under all the obligations which independent communities would be to adopt such measures, but also under the obligation which the constitution superadds, rendered more sacred, if possible, by the fact that, while the union imposes restrictions on the right of the slaveholding states to defend themselves, it affords the medium through which their peace and security are assailed. It is not the intention of the committee to enquire what those restrictions are, and what are the means, which, under the constitution, are left to the slaveholding states to protect themselves. The period has not yet come, and they trust never will, when it may be necessary to decide those questions; but, come it must, unless the states whose duty it is to suppress the danger shall see in time its magnitude, and the obligations which they are under to adopt speedy and effectual measures to arrest its further progress. That the full force of this obligation may be understood by all parties, the committee propose, in conclusion, to touch briefly on the movements of the abolitionists, with the view of showing the dangerous consequences to which they must lead if not arrested.

Their professed object is the emancipation of slaves in the southern states, which they propose to accomplish through the agency of organized societies, spread throughout the non-slaveholding states, and a powerful press, directed mainly to excite, in the other states, hatred and abhorrence against the institution and citizens of the slaveholding states, by addresses, lectures, and pictorial representations, abounding in false and exaggerated statements.

If the magnitude of the mischief affords, in any degree, the measure by which to judge of the criminality of a project, few have ever been devised to be compared with the present, whether the end be regarded, or the means by which it is proposed to be accomplished. The blindness of fanaticism is proverbial. With more zeal than understanding, it constantly misconceives the nature of the object at which it aims, and towards which it rushes with headlong violence, regardless of the means by which it is to be effected. Never was its character more fully exemplified than in the present instance. Setting out with the abstract principle that slavery is an evil, the fanatical zealots come at once to the conclusion that it is their duty to abolish it, regardless of all the disasters which must follow. Never was conclusion more false or dangerous. Admitting their assumption, there are innumerable things, which, regarded in the abstract, are evils, but which it would be madness to attempt to abolish. Thus regarded, government itself is an evil, with most of its institutions intended to protect life and property, comprehending the civil as well as the criminal and military codes, which are tolerated only because to abolish them would be to increase instead of diminishing the evil. The reason is equally applicable to the case under consideration; to illustrate which, a few remarks on slavery, as it actually exists in the southern states, will be necessary.

He who regards slavery in these states simply under that relation of master and slave, as important as that relation is, viewed as a question of property to the slaveholding section of the union, has a very imperfect conception of the institution, and the impossibility of abolishing it without disasters unexampled in the history of the world. To understand its nature and importance fully, it must be borne in mind that slavery, as it exists in the southern states, (including under the southern all the slaveholding states), involves not only the relation of master and slave, but, also, the social and political relations of two races, of nearly equal numbers, from different quarters of the globe, and the most opposite of all others in every particular that distinguishes one race of men from another. Emancipation would destroy these relations—would divest the masters of their property, and subvert the relation, social and political, that has existed between the races from almost the first settlement of the southern states.

It is not the intention of the committee to dwell on the pecuniary aspect of this vital subject; the vast amount of property involved, equal at least to \$950,000,000; the ruin of families and individuals; the impoverishment and prostration of an entire section of the union, and the fatal blow that would be given to the productions of the great agricultural staples, on which the commerce, the navigation, the manufactures, and the revenue of the country, almost entirely depend. As great as these disasters would be, they are nothing compared to what must follow the subversion of the existing relation between the two races, to which the committee will confine their remarks.

Under this relation, the two races have long lived in peace and prosperity, and, if not disturbed, would long continue so to live. While the European race has rapidly increased in wealth and numbers, and at the same time has maintained an equality, at least morally and intellectually, with their brethren of the non-slaveholding states, the African race has multiplied with not less rapidity, accompanied by great improvement, physically and intellectually, and the enjoyment of a degree of comfort with which the laboring class in few countries can compare, and confessedly greatly superior to what the free people of the same race possess in the non-slaveholding states. It may, indeed, be safely asserted that there is no example in history in which a savage people, such as their ancestors were when brought into the country, have ever advanced in the same period so rapidly in numbers and improvement.

To destroy the existing relation would be to destroy this prosperity, and to place the two races in a state of conflict, which must end in the expulsion or extermination of one or the other. No other can be substituted, compatible with their peace or security.

So strongly drawn is the line between the two, in consequence of it, and so strengthened by the force of habit and education, that it is impossible for them to exist together in the same community, where their numbers are so nearly equal as in the slaveholding states, under any other relation than that which now exists. Social and political equality between them is impossible. No power on earth can overcome the difficulty. The causes resisting lie too deep in the principles of our nature to be surmounted. But, without such equality, to change the present condition of the African race, were it possible, would be but to change the form of slavery. It would make them the slaves of the community, instead of the slaves of individuals, with less responsibility and interest in their welfare on the part of the community than is felt by their present masters; while it would destroy the security and independence of the European race, if the African should be permitted to continue in their changed condition within the limits of those states. They would look to the other states for support and protection, and would become, virtually, their allies and dependants; and would thus place in the hands of those states the most effectual instrument to destroy the influence and control the destiny of the rest of the union.

It is against this relation between the two races that the blind and criminal zeal of the abolitionists is directed—a relation that now preserves in quiet and security more than 6,500,000 human beings, and which cannot be destroyed without destroying the peace and prosperity of nearly half the states of the union, and involving their entire population in a deadly conflict, that must terminate either in the expulsion or extermination of those who are the objects of the misguided and false humanity of those who claim to be their friends.

He must be blind, indeed, who does not perceive that the subversion of a relation which must be followed with such disastrous consequences, can only be effected by convulsions that would devastate the country, burst asunder the bonds of the union, and engulf, in a sea of blood, the institutions of the country. It is madness to suppose that the slaveholding states would quietly submit to be sacrificed. Every consideration—interest, duty, and humanity; the love of country, the sense of wrong, hatred of oppressors, and treacherous and faithless confederates, and finally despair, would impel them to the most daring and desperate resistance in defence of property, family, country, liberty, and existence.

But wicked and cruel as is the end aimed at, it is fully equalled by the criminality of the means by which it is proposed to be accomplished. These, as has been stated, consist in organized societies and a powerful press, directed mainly with a view to excite the bitterest animosity and hatred of the people of the non-slaveholding states against the citizens and institutions of the slaveholding states. It is easy to see to what disastrous results such means must tend. Passing over the more obvious effects, their tendency to excite to insurrection and servile war, with all its horrors, and the necessity which such tendency must impose on the slaveholding states to resort to the most rigid discipline and severe police, to the great injury of the present condition of the slaves,—there remains another threatening incalculable mischief to the country.

The inevitable tendency of the means to which the abolitionists have resorted to effect their object, must, if persisted in, end in completely alienating the two great sections of the union. The incessant action of hundreds of societies, and a vast printing establishment, throwing out daily its thousands of artful and inflammatory publications, must make, in time, a deep impression on the section of the union where they freely circulate, and are mainly designed to have effect. The well-informed and thoughtful may hold them in contempt, but the young, the inexperienced, the ignorant, and the thoughtless, will receive the poison. In process of time, when the number of proselytes is sufficiently multiplied, the artful and profligate, who are on the watch to seize on any means, however wicked and dangerous, will unite with the fanatics, and make their movements the basis of a powerful political party, that will seek advancement by diffusing, as widely as possible, hatred against the slaveholding states. But, as hatred begets hatred, and animosity animosity, these feelings would become reciprocal, till every vestige of attachment would cease to exist between the two sections,—when the union and the constitution, the offspring of mutual affection and confidence, would forever perish.

Such is the danger to which the movements of the abolitionists expose the country. If the force of the obligation is in proportion to the magnitude of the danger, stronger cannot be imposed, than is at present, on the states within whose limits the danger originates, to arrest its further progress—a duty they owe, not only to the states whose institutions are assailed, but to the union and constitution, as has been shown, and, it may be added, to themselves. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of the non-slaveholding states, who have a deep stake in the existing institutions of the country, would have little forecast not to see that the assaults which are now directed against the institutions of the southern states may be very easily directed against those which uphold their own property and security. A very slight modification of the arguments used against the institutions which sustain the property and security of the south, would make them equally effectual against the institutions of the north, including banking, in which so vast an amount of its property and capital is invested. It would be well for those interested to reflect whether there now exists, or ever has existed, a wealthy and civilized community, in which one portion did not live on the labor of another; and whether the form in which slavery exists in the south, is not but a modification of this universal condition, and, finally, whether any other, under all the circumstances of the case, is more defensible, or stands on stronger grounds of necessity. It is time to look these questions in the face.—Let those who are interested remember that labor is the only source of wealth, and how small a portion of it, in all old and civilized countries, even the best governed, is left to those by whose labor wealth is created. Let them also reflect how little volition or agency the operatives of any country have in the question of its distribution—as little, with a few exceptions, as the African of the slaveholding states has in the distribution of the proceeds of his labor. Nor is it less oppressive; that in the one case it is effected by the stern and powerful will of the government, and in the other by the more feeble and flexible will of a master. If one be an evil, so is the other. The only difference is the amount and mode of exaction and distribution, and the agency by which they are effected.

A BILL, prohibiting deputy postmasters from receiving or transmitting through the mail, to any state, territory, or district, certain papers, therein mentioned, the circulation of which, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, may be prohibited, and for other purposes.

*The article is in the following words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that it shall not be lawful for any deputy-master, in any state, territory, or district, knowingly to receive and put into the mail, any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other papers, printed or written, or pictorial representation, touching the subject of slavery, addressed to any person or post-office, in any state, territory, or district, where, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, their circulation is prohibited. Nor shall it be lawful for any deputy-master, in said state, territory, or district, knowingly to deliver to any person any such pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, to any person whatever, except to such person or persons, as are duly authorized, by the proper authority of such state, territory, or district, to receive the same.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that it shall be the duty of the post-master-general, to dismiss from office, any deputy-master offending in the premises, and such deputy-master shall, on conviction thereof, in any court having competent jurisdiction, be fined in any sum not less than \$100, and not more than \$500, according to the aggravation of the offence, at the discretion of the court.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that it shall be the duty of deputy-masters, mail-carriers and other officers, and agents of the post-office department, to co-operate, as far as may be, to prevent the circulation of any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, as aforesaid, in any state, territory, or district, where, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, the same are prohibited, and that nothing in the acts of Congress to establish and regulate the post-office department, shall be construed to protect any deputy-master, mail-carrier, or other officer of said department, convicted of knowingly circulating in any state, territory, or district, as aforesaid, any such pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, forbidden by the laws of such state, territory, or district.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, that it shall be the duty of the post-master-general, to furnish to the deputy-masters and their agents and officers, at the department, copies of the laws of the several states, territories, and districts, prohibiting the publication or circulation of any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, within the limits of said states, territories, or districts, for their government in the premises; and make such regulations, and give such instructions in carrying this act into effect, as may not be made contrary to law.

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the deputy-masters of the offices where the pamphlets, newspapers, hand-bills, or other papers, printed or written, or pictorial representations aforesaid may be deposited, shall, under the instructions of the post-master-general, from time to time, give notice of the same, so that they may be withdrawn by the person depositing them; and if not withdrawn in the space of one month thereafter, shall be burnt, or otherwise destroyed.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Officers of the Anti-Slavery Meeting.

GENTLEMEN:—According to a previous intimation given to the editor of the Philanthropist, I proceed to examine the reported doings of the Anti-Slavery Meeting, recently held in your city. Though, as the organs of that body, you have, by the language used, and the manner of treating the subject which called it together, forfeited all claim to be regarded as high minded or candid opponents; yet it is hoped that I shall not evince the same spirit. My principles forbid me to render "railing for railing." Whatever severity or harshness may appear in this, or any subsequent communication, must be accounted for on the score, that some of the sentiments maintained by you on that occasion, demand severity of rebuke.

The way in which the meeting was first suggested, as connected with subsequent developments, is surprising; and calculated to convey the idea, that besides the ostensible object, there was a latent one which cannot be justified by "law abiding men." If I mistake not, the first notice of a meeting was given in the Cincinnati Whig of Jan. 16, in the following words:—"It will be seen by the Cincinnati Gazette of the 15th inst., that an attempt is making by James G. Birney and his deluded followers, to create an excitement in this city, on the subject of slavery. In order to the protection of our property, &c., would it not be well that a meeting of our citizens be called to take the matter into consideration?" Now what can the meaning of such an advertisement be? "The avowed object of the suggestion, is the protection of our property." Whoever believed that the discussion of slavery would have a tendency to the destruction of property in Cincinnati? Or is the gentleman of the Whig, and his anonymous correspondent, practising slavery in despite of the constitution and laws of Ohio? That is the only kind of property, whose tenure can by any possible construction, be endangered by such discussions. The above notice implies very strongly that anti-slavery men are in the habit of injuring their neighbors' substance. Where have they ever been known to put forth their hands, to pull down churches, and private dwellings; or to glut their avarice by robbing others? Or is it intended, that unless something be done, to suppress their sentiments, the slaveholders, on the other side of the river, will make an onset upon the city, and wrap it in flames? I am not one of those who believe that the south will make war upon the north, because of the agitation of this subject. The lawless among them may attack some of our citizens, as they travel through that region. But all that frothy vapouring exhibited by southern politicians, and heady appeals to the cupidity of the free states, are not the harbingers of war; but are intended to intimidate abolitionists from their purpose, and enlist commercial men, and office-seekers in their cause. No man in his senses, ever thought it necessary to call a meeting to guard his property against the attacks of abolitionists, or the tendency of the discussion, in Cincinnati. Wherever attacks have been made upon public or private property, in consequence of the agitation of the subject, they have been made upon the abolitionists. No, gentleman, you have nothing to fear from such attacks; for has it ever been known that men have desolated their own estates by means of mobs? Therefore, the avowed object as stated above, is not the true one, and we must search for another. This view of the subject is confirmed, by the fact, that no measures for "the protection of property" were adopted by the meeting. The latent object, and I suppose the true one, is contained under the "and." What this object is, it is difficult to determine, disconnected with subsequent events. When contrasted with some things, which made their appearance during the meeting, is it not clear that an attack

upon the property of abolitionists, and their dearest rights was premeditated? That this was intended by the correspondent of the Whig, I have no doubt. And it seems you were fully aware of this contemplated violence, as is evident from the following extracts.

"The speaker (Mr. Lytle), then showed that abolitionists ought not to be tolerated." "Mr. Hale here rose, and contended with great earnestness that the names should be read. He wished to have the public to know, who the abolitionists were." Now, why have the names of individuals read in a public meeting, professedly assembled to express an opinion of sentiments, and not to hold men up to reproach? When you recur to the publication in the Whig, and then consider the spirit manifested by a large part of the meeting, was not the object to be gained in reading the names, that their property might be the more easily pointed out to an infuriated mob? What else could have been designed? I am unable to see any other just conclusion to which a reader of these proceedings can arrive. Judge Wright rose again, and said, "he hoped that when the resolutions were passed, all would retire to their homes as good citizens. It has been the praise of Cincinnati, that no tumults like those in other cities have occurred. While careful for the lives and property of our friends at the south, let us not forget the rights of our fellow-citizens at home." Such suggestions were egregiously out of place, if the speaker had believed, that all present were "law abiding men." To a meeting composed entirely of such men, they would be an insult; and nothing but an understanding of the state of things, could ever have brought them to Judge Wright's mind. The chairman evidently felt the incongruity of broaching such suggestions to an assembly who were all "law abiding men." "The chairman rose and said he thanked Judge Wright for his suggestions, but they were hardly necessary." There must have been, in the opinion of the mayor (chairman), a great and favorable change in the popular sentiment of the city, since the time he came to the editor of the Philanthropist and dissuaded him from the exercise of his constitutional rights to "print and speak,"—alleging as a reason, that their use would at once raise a mob that would be altogether uncontrollable. To peaceful men they were not necessary. Yet somehow, they appeared necessary to Judge Wright; and what could have created the necessity, but an understanding of the state of feeling, and the confusion, and disorder in the house? It is not my intention to implicate all the men who attended that meeting. But, that purposes of violence were contemplated, seems to me, indisputable. As regards the article from the Whig, I am not supported in my conclusions. There is a higher authority, and authority that will have its weight with you. Hear the editor of the Gazette. "The suggestion in the Whig article, that in order to the protection of our property, a public meeting may be necessary, is of an equally ominous and odious character. None can apprehend danger to 'our property' from the Anti-Slavery Society as it exists in this vicinity. From whom then is this danger to be apprehended? Surely it is not intended to suggest a lawless attack upon the property of anti-slavery men? And yet this seems to be the only obvious interpretation of the publication." The same conclusion to which I have come, in relation to the Whig and his correspondent, is, I trust that able editors mind also. And he pronounces it "the only obvious interpretation."

And you, Gentlemen, contemplated an attack upon their right to freedom of speech and of the press; as is evident from the following: One of you, (Mr. Lytle) contended that, "abolitionists ought not to be tolerated." What is this—the accompanying circumstances considered—but a declaration, that they should be deprived of their rights as citizens? And how different from the sentiment, that even "error of opinion may be safely tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it." Again you say, "We will join in recommending the prompt and efficient legislation of this state, in conjunction with the other members of the confederacy, to arrest their designs. This meeting will exert every lawful effort to suppress the publication of any abolition paper in this city, or neighborhood." What power has the legislature of this state to abridge their right to freedom of speech, and of the press? Is not their right in this respect as clearly defended by the constitution as your own? And yet you threaten to call in its powers to assist you in your crusade against them! And what "lawful effort" can you use? You can attempt to write down such a publication, or in public debate, you can attempt to argue the sentiments out of your city, if you feel yourselves able for the combat. But what other lawful effort can you use? True, you can excite and stimulate the "base sort," to demolish such an establishment; but how will it look for law abiding men to be engaged in such nefarious business! And even then you would have to be careful, lest a more potent enemy should spring out of its ashes. The word "suppress" is incompatible with lawful efforts, and is somewhat ominous. Surely you did not take time sufficient, to consider such a declaration, couched in such language, before you published it to the world. What would you say if abolitionists, in public meetings, should declare, they would use every "lawful effort," to suppress the publication of the Cincinnati Whig or Gazette? You would immediately enquire what lawful effort? And would you not laugh them to scorn? Be not surprised then, if they should smile at your feeble menaces. If they have anything to fear, is it the unlawful efforts of their opposers. These seem to those who use them, doubtless, the most effectual—and considering the peace and honor of the country, are most to be dreaded—yet even they, as well as "lawful efforts," will be found insufficient to arrest the cause.

It is susceptible of demonstration, that they have as much right to publish their sentiments from the press, as the above named editors have theirs. But should it be admitted, that you have a right to exercise exclusive dictatorship, to the people within the city, and to establish a censorship of the press within its limits, what right have you to extend these powers over the people of the country? And will you not be guilty of meddling with domestic arrangements? You need not be astonished if such aristocratical swaggering, as you have evinced on this subject, should be held in utter abhorrence by the honest yeomenry of the country. And be assured its only tendency is to sink the men, and their cause who attempt it; and to advance the interests of those whom you now pretend to condemn.

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY

DR. JAMES ANDERSON says,—"The labor of a West India slave costs about three as much as it would cost if executed by a free man."

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, MARCH 4, 1836.

The Cincinnati Preamble and Resolutions.

NUMBER III.

To JOHN C. WRIGHT, Esq.—

In my remarks, last week, I endeavored to bring into prominence these truths:—

1. That the right to publish opinions—of which speaking, writing, and printing, are but modes—is a natural right—derived from our Creator—belonging to us as men—of which no human authority can justly deprive us.

2. That, the wrongs growing out of the abuse of this right were to be restrained, as other wrongs,—by the certainty of punishment;—but, that the right to publish opinions was not to be subjected to any previous restraint, from fear that it might become a wrong, any more than other unquestionable rights. An illustration was found in the right to use our legs for locomotion—it would be absurd to tie them to-day, lest in the use of my right to move about at pleasure, they might carry me to-morrow into my neighbor's field to tread down his herbage.

3. That the constitution of the United States does not by any express provision "acknowledge" the right of southern slaveholders to enslave their colored brethren, any more than that it acknowledges the right of a foreign despot, with whom our government may have intercourse, to oppress his subjects—or of the Russian nobility to make slaves of their fellow-men.

4. That no "effort" against the freedom of the press and of speech can be "lawful"—that it is actually a contradiction in terms.

5. That in your resolutions you condemn abolitionists—not for investigating the subject of southern slavery, but for not arriving at the same conclusions in relation to it that you have.

That we may keep in view, with all necessary exactness, the subject of the following comments, let us recall the words of the resolution.

"That this meeting will exert every lawful effort to suppress the publication of any abolition paper in this city or neighborhood. And, that they advise, in a spirit of frankness, such as may be concerned in a project of this description, to abandon the attempt."

Now, sir, allowing to the abolition meeting all the "respectability and intelligence"—aye, and religion, too, which its busy heralds claim for it, and which we will not stop to deny may amount to an entire sufficiency for the highest purposes of legislation;—allowing them, I say, all this, and, besides, the unquestionable right to enact such an ordinance, and to command all the good people of Cincinnati to observe it with the most faithful obedience,—from what source do you derive the authority to exercise jurisdiction over "the neighborhood?" Did the neighboring towns assent, in any way, to such an extension of your power? The call was for "a meeting of the citizens of Cincinnati"—signed exclusively, we believe, by citizens. Was there, then, any country or "neighborhood" representative, present at the meeting, by whom you were authorized, in the name of those whom he represented, to extend your friendly and vigilant supervision over their portion of the public press? If so, sir, let his name and the extent of his commission be known. If not—you have fallen into a most shameful and barefaced violation of your own principles—for whilst you are condemning abolitionists for meddling with what belongs, exclusively, to other people, you yourselves, in taking charge, without any authority, of the concerns of the "neighborhood" are guilty of the same trespass and indecorum.

But it may be easily accounted for: zeal, without knowledge, especially in a cause radically and incurably bad, has manifold delinquencies, under the name of over-sights, to be excused. And, surely, yours has been of no ordinary heat; for, so far as I have knowledge of the doings of the pro-slavery aristocratical assemblies, held, during the last six months, in several of our eastern cities, to take into consideration the propriety of surrendering the outposts of liberty into the hands of their slaveholding assailants, they have been far surpassed by the "great anti-abolition meeting in Cincinnati." If favor is to be won by the most humble subservience, surely you and your coadjutors can expect no small share of it from your southern friends. For, do but review for a moment what you have essayed—just look at the sum of your most obsequious undertakings:—

First—you pledge yourselves to make war ("lawful," of course) on the constitutional right possessed by every man in Ohio, "to speak, print, and write, on any subject as he pleases." Second—you promise to bar free discussion on the very subject of all others now the most interesting to the public mind, and of course, most calling for discussion, out of your "houses"—your "counting-rooms"—your "workshops." Third—you take under your care a large body of your immediate fellow-citizens, who had no hand in your meeting, who repudiate with utter abhorrence the principles promulgated there, and reject with scorn the domestic inquisition to which you are striving to subject them. And, fourthly,—not content with an ordinary measure of humiliation before your southern dictators—with such as other cities have thought would be sufficient to satisfy reasonable taskmasters—you have, as it were, in the very wantonness of subservience, outstripped all precedent, and achieved for yourselves the most enviable distinction among the submissive, when you pledge yourselves to extend your regards, unasked, to the town of Richmond—that it, too, might be pressed into the ranks of "respectability and intelligence" so patriotically engaged in "lawful efforts" to prostrate the freedom of the press and of speech. Truly, sir, the unworthiness of your object is somewhat relieved by the boldness of your attempt.

I now come to consider the latter part of this resolution in which "in a spirit of frankness, you advise such as may be concerned in a project of this description to abandon the attempt." That this was intended for me, personally, you will not deny—as no other paper of the kind was proposed to be published here, and as I am the only person "concerned in the project" of publishing the Philanthropist. It would seem strange—were it not so common—to see with what unvarying uniformity, one injudicious step impels, even, wise men to take others, that even the unlearned fairly pronounce to be silly. Having resolved that a lawful establishment shall be put down by "lawful efforts"—you next proceed, with all frankness, to "advise" me, with whom you had no personal acquaintance, and whom you had come together to anathematize. You seem to have forgotten even the common proprieties of life—and that, advice among equals, ought not under such circumstances to be tendered without solicitation. Really, sir, to one out of his minority some twenty years or more, this must appear like the very concrete of kind-

ness and care. We will proceed to test its sincerity and its claims to all praise, by taking an analogous case, in which you shall have all the advantage of this "advice" given "in a spirit of frankness."

Suppose that, I, together with some fifty-seven (the number of names signed to your call) of my abolition friends in Cincinnati, take it into our heads, that John C. Wright, Esq., being a very able and experienced lawyer, is about to engage, for the purpose of bringing suit, in the investigation of a certain set of claims; the results of which we know will be—if he succeed in getting justice—that we, and many of our friends elsewhere, will be compelled to restore a great deal of ill-gotten gain to a vast number of needy widows and neglected orphans, and on which we and our abolition allies are now living in nabobical splendor—we lay our heads together, concocting a plan of this kind, that there shall be a fierce onset made on you by such of the newspapers as are in our interest and have the same stake with us—they shall call you, "fanatic"—"incendiary"—"firebrand"—"disorganizer"—and almost every other name that can be found, tending to bring on you popular suspicion and indignation; we abuse all that may think well of you or your honorable effort, no matter how well their general conduct speaks for them; we alarm the weak, the ignorant, the indolent, the aristocratic, the capitalist, the merchant, the tradesman,—persuading them you intend to change in into out, and out into in—up into down, and down into up; we say, it is absolutely necessary for the safety of the country [meaning by the country nothing more nor less than our honorable selves] that you be put down; finally we bring all together, "black spirits and white, blue spirits and grey," into the very hall of justice as if to mock the cause to which it is sacred; a few of our most intemperate ring-leaders in this work of patriotism, make exciting and furious appeals to the crowd, and when we think they are sufficiently screwed up to the sticking place, we submit the following resolution—

Resolved—That this meeting will exert every lawful effort to prevent John C. Wright, Esq., from bringing suit on certain claims—admitted to be just, in the abstract—in which five hundred thousand neglected fathers and mothers, with their one milliru injured and helpless children have rights, to a large amount, even to their liberty, now and forever involved; but, which claims, if justice be rendered, will throw society [that is our noble selves and our friends] into strange confusion;—resolved, we say, that we will exert every "lawful effort" to prevent the said John C. Wright, Esq., from bringing said suits, not only in the courts of this city, but in any of the courts of the neighboring counties—and that we advise in the spirit of frankness, the said John C. Wright, to abandon the attempt.

Now, sir, the tables being turned, I ask your judgment;—what would you think of such a proceeding? Would you honor "advice" thus given as proceeding from a spirit of true frankness—or would you disdain it as the disguised menace or the deliberate insult, of those who felt that they had power, which if it failed to intimidate, could yet be brought to crush every barrier of the laws to which you looked for protection and safety? What would you think of the spirit of men who would band together, to prevent you, in any way, from exercising a right secured to you by the most solemn provisions of the fundamental law of the land, and unforbidden by the higher law of God? Would you expect that men, who could thus calmly resolve to silence the advocate of claims founded in justice and urged by mercy would, all confine themselves to lawful efforts against you? And would you, sir,—even in the view of peril from wicked men—abandon to hopeless despair, your two millions of confiding clients—could you behold the tears of the oppressed and of them that have no comforter, and quietly agree to consign them and their cause to oppressors who have power, whilst their cries for freedom, for freedom—for the freedom which God has made the birthright of all—pierce your ears, and God himself is commanding you to "plead their cause" and encouraging you by the declaration that He is their friend? You would not—you could not. Then why ask it of me!

Next week I shall bring under examination your separate assault on the freedom of speech and opinion.

Our Press.

Last week, we intimated our intention of removing the press to Cincinnati. This we expect to do, as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made. If by nothing else, we should be led to this, by the trouble and inconvenience to which we are subjected, by having the press so far from our place of residence. We furnish an unusual share of editorial matter for the Philanthropist—we have for a long time kept up, and still contrive to keep up, a large correspondence, by letter, with our abolition friends, and we lecture and debate occasionally on the merits of our cause. We have domestic cares, of no trifling pressure to attend to. Beside all this, the present arrangement throws on us the necessity of attending to much of the office business, which if we had the press in Cincinnati, could be as well done by another. To attend to these things, beside others which it is unnecessary to mention—with a subtraction, too, of, at least, one-fourth of our working time, in the actual transition from Cincinnati to New Richmond, is a "wear and tear," mentally and bodily, which we could not long sustain.

In addition to this, the mail, to and from New Richmond is not only irregular and uncertain, but altogether insufficient for the conveyance of anything like the main body of our papers. During the late inclement weather which closed the river for several weeks, we travelled the road between Cincinnati and this place, twice a week, on horseback, through mud and snow and rain and ice and storm,—not unfrequently carrying in saddle-bags the papers for our Cincinnati subscribers. The expense of transporting our papers to Cincinnati to be mailed for distant subscribers, falls on our private means entirely.

I would ask any candid man if the sacrifices, mentioned above, do not constitute too large an obligation to the pro-slavery influence existing in the metropolis of this free state? And whether it ought to be continued any longer? We are satisfied the answer will be, No.

But these personal inconveniences, great as they assuredly are, do not supply the main reason for taking the press to Cincinnati. It may be agreeably indicated by an anecdote told of the celebrated William Penn,—whose father was an admiral in the English service, attached to the court, and of course to the establishment. He looked on his son's becoming a Quaker, as such thorough and vulgar and reclamation fanaticism, that he cast him off, and forbade him his presence altogether. However, the unbending integrity of the son did not fail to produce its proper effect on the father's heart. The latter became reconciled—but still insisted on his son's giving up the

wearing of his hat in company. [The reason for this custom of the Quakers is, even now, but little understood. So far from being an indication of that rusticity which is ignorant, or of that rudeness which is regardless, of the genuine proprieties of social intercourse, it is intended as a peaceful, yet open, declaration, that all men are created equal, and that no man is entitled to acts of "obedience" from his fellow-man.] Finding him unyielding, or, what he probably called perverse, in this matter, the father proposed, by way of compromise, that he should wear his hat anywhere, and everywhere, excepting only in the presence of the king and the Duke of York. His noble son replied, that in their presence he should be careful to wear it.—"Why?" asked the impatient admiral. "Because," was the answer, "it is there that my right to wear it is disputed."

So with us. It is in Cincinnati, that the liberty of the press is disputed. It is there, that a pro-slavery aristocracy made up of "capitalists, merchants, and tradesmen, whose interests are linked in with the south," has been arrayed against it—and it is there we intend to have it publicly demonstrated to the people of Ohio, which is strongest—they, declaring their will through the constitution of the state; or the slaveholders of the south, declaring theirs, through their willing coadjutors in our midst.

We commenced our paper out of the city—not with any intention of surrendering a right of which every individual, however humble, is made the keeper for his own and the common good—a trust which in our case, we think, no act of ours will ever bring into dishonor; but that the character of our paper might be known throughout the country, that in this character there might not be found, even a plausible occasion for an outbreak against the public peace;—and that, should such a disgrace be brought on our metropolis, no excuse should be found by its mobocratic and insurrectionary instigators. This part of our object is accomplished. The Philanthropist pervades the whole state—its character is known to multitudes of the freemen of Ohio and the United States. There is but one testimony returned to the editor by those who take it—and that, of approbation of the calm, and firm, yet impartial manner in which the agitating subject to which it is chiefly devoted, is treated, and of the fixed yet unimpassioned determination it exhibits to maintain the great principles, by which the blessings of liberty are now enjoyed by us and are to be transmitted to our children.

A few words to the two dough-face editors in Cincinnati—who, by a few months of humble drudgery in the cause of oppression, have won for themselves a notoriety, which none,—unless it be the wholesale executors of the despot Nicholas can envy,—and which will be extinguished only by the growing accumulation of contempt which the awakened influence of truth and liberty will cast upon it—to you we say, be still, be still,—and there will be no disturbance of the public peace, or soil upon our city's honorable fame. But if you will persist,—if, notwithstanding our earnest entreaty—our solemn expostulation, you will again rush to your task of summoning the disorderly to trample on the press—to overthrow the constitution, and to cover our untarnished escutcheon with effaceless stains—then on your heads be the guilt, and the shame and the scorn of disrobing your country, and exposing her, defiled and naked, to the world.

Anti-Slavery Intelligence.

[From the (Utica) Standard and Democrat.]

THEODORE D. WELD.—This distinguished philanthropist and unrelenting advocate for the abolition of slavery, is now delivering a course of lectures in this city. He commenced on Monday evening last, and will continue for several evenings to come. Every night finds his audience greatly increased. The crowd has already become too great to be conveniently accommodated at the Bleeker street church, and the friends of human rights entertain the hope that the trustees of the first church will, ere long, open its doors to the people. They must be aware that such is the wish of a majority of that congregation.

Mr. Weld, in point of talent, in point of learning, in point of genius, and in point of zeal, in whatever he undertakes, is not excelled by any young man in the United States. Hence it is, that wherever he goes, the clamors of mobs are hushed in silence, the attention of the public is arrested and riveted to what he says, and the conviction of the truth of the doctrines he promulgates, is forced home upon the minds of the people. It is, of course, useless for us to urge the people to attend, the crowd is already too great, we repeat, to be conveniently accommodated until another place is provided. Yet, we would say to every one who can get a chance to hear, to go and listen to him.

To the dough-face editors of our own city do we especially recommend a careful consideration of these facts:

1. On the 21st day of October last a mob, led on by a member of Congress and a Judge, broke up, in this same city of Utica, the New York Anti-Slavery Convention, after, however, the constitution for a state anti-slavery society had been adopted. On this day, the mob seemed to be triumphant, and constitutions and laws overthrown.

2. On the 4th day of last January—in this same city of Utica, 60 young men, openly, in the Methodist church formed an anti-slavery society, and adopted spirited resolutions in favor of the supremacy of laws and the re-establishment of liberty.

3. On the 7th day of February, the "abolition incendiary" Theodore D. Weld, is speaking in behalf of laws and liberty, in the same city of Utica, to a crowd already become too great to be accommodated in the very identical church, from which the mob routed the anti-slavery convention,—and not a dough-face ventured to disturb.

Now, slipping the slaveholder's harness, but for a moment, consider—are not these facts striking!—ought they not to arrest your attention? You cannot doubt it. What now will you do? For rest assured—if not a single slave should be emancipated in the south, the free states will speedily pass fresh sentence of condemnation on every form of oppression, and in tones so loud and terrible, that every dough-face will be compelled, as a ghost at cock-crow, to hide himself in the dark regions of the south.

Slaveholding Devices.

LYSANDER, the tyrant, was used to say—when the lion's skin was not sufficient for him, he tacked to it the fox's tail. So it is with our slaveholding —. Whilst they roar in Congress as lions—they do not despise the part of foxes at home. It is becoming quite a common device, that public sympathy may be excited in favor of oppressors and hatred against abolitionists, to raise reports of slave-insurrections. But nothing shows more plainly that the fox is about being run down, than his repeated doubles.

[From the (Philadelphia) Eve. Star.]

THE REPORTED INSURRECTION IN NASHVILLE.

Something like a sensation was produced this morning by the publication of a letter, containing intelligence of an insurrection of the slaves in Nashville, Tennessee.

If it should turn out to be an imposition on the publisher, it is to be hoped they may be successful in ferreting out the offender and bringing him to condign punishment. It was no doubt written for the purpose of increasing the existing excitement, and operating to the prejudice of the colored population by producing a sense of alarm, and inflaming the public mind. The destruction of the bank, gives it the appearance of a fiction, and we think so it will prove.

Since the foregoing was written, we understand that the publisher has offered a reward of one hundred dollars for the detection of the author of the letter.

The Cincinnati Gazette.

For the independent course taken by Mr. Hammond, at a time when the slaveholding influence, working through the dough-face prints of this city, seemed likely to overwhelm all that is precious to freemen among us—we render all honor. Whilst we freely do this—and whilst we are very sure, that no course which that editor may hereafter take, will lead us, in the smallest degree, to undervalue what he has done, we yet cannot pass unnoticed the wrong he is doing the abolitionists by such expressions as are to be found in his editorial remarks under the head of "Slave Market" in his paper of 25th ult. Speaking of the increased demand for slaves in the District of Columbia, our great slave market, and of the growing regularity of the traffic in human beings as carried on from the ports of that District with those of the south, he uses these words:—

"Here the fanatic, general abolitionist may learn a lesson.—The rash, crude, and extravagantly fanatical movements of the anti-slavery societies have caused this revolution of sentiment—have lighted a flame which spurs the admonition of reason, and the demands of justice, and which half a century may not extinguish."

Now, if Mr. H. will take the trouble to make specifications of conduct on the part of abolitionists by which he thinks such expressions are warranted, abolitionists will no doubt be obliged to him. As it now stands, they think such generalities of abuse, to be unjust; and on the part of Mr. H. especially, in no small degree, *inexcusable*. He is now asked, in terms of all due respect, either to desist in future from such vague, yet injurious expressions against a rapidly growing class of his fellow-citizens—or to produce facts, and from them to justify the coarseness of his invectives.

We claim nothing but what we believe to be right. In urging such a claim, we expect to be found no respecter of persons,—be they aristocratic or republican—whig or tory—rich or poor—learned or unlearned. What we claim from others, we will not be slow to render to others.

Arkansas.

The Arkansas Convention have framed a constitution, in anticipation of the admission of the territory into the confederacy of states. Mr. C. F. M. Noland has been appointed a messenger to carry the constitution to Washington city. We have glanced hastily at some of its provisions. The members of the lower branch of the legislature are to be chosen once in two years, and the members of the senate once in four; and the legislature is to have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves without the consent of their owners.—*Louis Jour.*

The information contained in the above article should excite every friend of freedom in our country to renewed exertion. The late action of the lower house of Congress in regard to the petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—and any action which may be anticipated on the same subject from the senate, leave scarcely a hope, but that our "field of blood" is to be formally enlarged and guarded by the sanctions of organic law from all intrusion on the part of religion, liberty, and mercy.

The constitution of Arkansas on which the Congress of the United States is called to judge whether she shall be admitted into the union or not, contains in it a provision formally to perpetuate (for it amounts to nothing else) the most heartless and grinding system of oppression that has ever disgraced any country, and that is fast leading ours to a crisis of degradation, at which her worst enemies may rejoice.

George Thompson.

Our friend Thompson arrived, safe, in England, on the 4th of January. We rejoice to hear it, and wish, not only for his sake, but theirs, that Mrs. T. and her little children (including his young George Washington) may soon be welcomed by their father, on their equally safe arrival. The following is an extract from his letter to Mr. Garrison:—

Governor McDuffie's speech fills every eye by whom it is perused, with horror and astonishment. If such sentiments were not found in *American* type, upon *American* paper, issued from public and unquestionable sources, they would scarcely gain credit in this country, so widely are they at variance with every principle of truth and justice, and so full are they of blasphemous imputations, and absurd perversions of the letter and spirit of the Bible. The legislature of a civilized state—a christian people, and an enlightened world, gravely told by the highest executive officer of one of the republican states of North America, that "no human institution is more manifestly consistent with the will of God, than domestic slavery!" And again, "that domestic slavery, instead of being a political evil, is the corner-stone of your republican edifice!" Surely hell must have given nine cheers for Governor McDuffie.

Advertisements

FOR MEN ESCAPING FROM SLAVERY.

We noticed in the last Lexington Intelligencer what, we had supposed, we should never see in that print—an advertisement for a runaway slave. We were formerly under the impression, that such things were excluded from its columns. Would either of the editors engage in the business of catching runaways, for reward? We know, neither of them would. And yet what is the difference in principle, between the two cases,—of him who, for reward, gives the clue to overtake a man, straining for his liberty,—and the "slave-catcher" who overtakes and returns him to aggravated and hopeless bondage. But if the Intelligencer, at the Pretorium of Kentucky-slavery deserves rebuke, what shall be said of leading journals in the free states which do the same thing? Surely such work ought not to be taken out of the hands of our dough-faces to whom it properly belongs.

Correction.

We were rather too fast, in saying a week or two ago, that the sole honor of returning our paper with abusive language written on the margin, was due to an editor at Nashville, professing to publish a religious newspaper. Since then, a competitor, the editor of the South Carolina Times, at Columbia, has put in his claims to this honor.

He returned our first number with the "pictorial" of a gallows and a man suspended from it, on the margin immediately over our name, with this superscription—"wishing you may soon be an upright man." Our second number was returned with the same "pictorial," the

superscription being changed thus—"wishing you a speedy elevation to the place you deserve."

We have also received a few abusive letters, which carry with them such decisive internal evidence of the vulgarity and ignorance of the writers, that we do not wish to take any further notice of them. It may perhaps, be the means of stopping them entirely, for such persons to be informed, that the post-master at New Richmond does not exact from us the postage—on such papers. So if to charge us with the postage be their object, they will not effect it.

Trouble in the Wigwam.

Mr. PICKNEY of South Carolina introduced the resolution into the House of Representatives in Congress, by which that House was excused from saying, that Congress had no power under the constitution to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. For this, Mr. Wise, of Virginia, who seems to be a genuine Drawansir, said in a speech, "I spurn and hiss at him [Mr. P.] as a deserter from the principles of the south."

Ohio Anti-Slavery Anniversary.

Is it not time some arrangements were making for holding—say in April,—the first anniversary of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society?

Anti-Slavery Societies.

THERE are now more than FOUR HUNDRED anti-slavery societies auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society.

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS—may be had by neighboring societies, by making application to any of the following gentlemen, officers or members of the Board of Managers of the Cincinnati Anti-Slavery Society:—James C. Ludlow, Isaac Colby, William T. Truman, James G. Birney, Gamaliel Bailey, Jr., William Donaldson, John Melendy, F. A. Sayre, C. Donaldson, M. R. Robinson, Rees E. Price, Benjamin Bassett, J. C. Clopper, A. Hopkins, Thomas Maylin, or William Holyoke.

PERSONS in Cincinnati wishing to subscribe for the Philanthropist may leave their names with any of the following gentlemen:—C. Donaldson & Co., Main street—A. Kellogg, Fifth street—John Melendy, Main street, near Corporation Line—William Holyoke, Sycamore street—Dr. Isaac Colby, Broadway—or Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, Fifth street, between Race and Elm.

Editorial Correspondence.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.—*From a slave state*—and from one who is not an abolitionist.—"I wish those Cincinnati editors could know the estimate in which they are held among the people, whose favor they imagine they are getting by their servile course. Even slaveholders feel towards them as Philip of Macedon is said to have felt towards the orators of Greece, whom he had bribed to gull the people into a surrender of their liberties—"he loved the treason, but despised the traitors." I do not much wonder, however, that a man in a free state who wishes, for the sake of some petty interest, to crush freedom of speech and discussion, should have little sympathy with the slave. His own fawning, cringing, and servile spirit makes him feel as though it were no great hardship to have a master. He feels that the negro ought to be content to have his body owned by another, if he receives in return enough to eat; for he knows that he himself is willing, for a mess of pottage, to sell to the negro's master, what is of more value than the freedom of the body—the independence of the soul. The men in the free states are regarded by slaveholders, in the same light in which they regard the overseers—as a very useful class, who for a small consideration, will engage to do their dirty work."

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Demand of the Slaveholders.

HERE it is, at last, the demand—we will not say of Virginia—but of the slaveholding aristocracy of Virginia. Mild and modest demand! How chivalric!! How humane!! How conciliatory!! What are the free sovereignties of the north called upon to do? Only to crouch down before the sovereignties of the south, smite their foreheads in the dust, and quietly open their mouths to receive the imperial gag! Only, with profound submission, to make themselves thoroughly and forever worthy of the epithet, which a chivalric southerner uses to express the *ne plus ultra* of his contempt—*SLAVES!* Let us paraphrase a little. The plain English of the whole is, and is intended to be, this: "We the mighty representatives of that part of the people of Virginia who own the other part, and whose honorable business it is to raise and drive to the southern market the increase of the said other part, do proclaim and demand as fellows, to wit:

TO ALL "CO-STATES" WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, GREETING:—

Know ye by these presents, that we, the said representatives of the part of the people of Virginia aforesaid, are the true and only expounders of the constitution; therefore approach respectfully, renounce your political creeds, repeat of your inalienable rights, and reverently swear unto the words of us, your masters. (*Jurate in verba magistr!*)

[The leaders of all political parties approach, trembling and dough-faced, and take the following oath:—

Slaveholders.—You do solemnly swear, that two and two do not always make four.

Dough-faces.—We do solemnly swear it.

Slaveholders.—You do, therefore, further solemnly swear, that men are not born equal, but on the contrary some are born to be men, and some are born to be brutes.

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—And that there are no such things as "inalienable rights."

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—And that you have no right to print anything, or form any associations in regard to slavery without our leave.

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—And when the constitution forbids Congress to pass "any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press," the states are thereby solemnly bound to punish their citizens for exercising such freedom.

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—And that when the constitution gives Congress "exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever," in the District of Columbia, it gives it no power to abolish slavery there.

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—And that you have no right to interfere with slavery anywhere and in any manner whatsoever.

Dough-faces.—We swear it.

Slaveholders.—Kiss the book.—Well done, hypocritical scoundrels. Go in peace. But mark, if you ever dare to open your lips or set a type on this "delicate subject" again, without our leave, we will dash this union into ten thousand fragments!"

But we have digressed. Here is the document, and it will doubtless prove as effectual to stop the

progress of abolitionism as the whips and chains of Xerxes did to tranquilize the naughty waves of the Hellespont.—*Emancipator.*

From the Richmond Compiler, Jan. 21.

THE ABOLITION QUESTION SETTLED.

About 6 o'clock yesterday evening, the House of Delegates got through the perplexing question of the last ten days. We have not room to give the details nor are they very important at this moment. As general a concurrence has been attained on the resolutions as could possibly have been expected, after the contrariety of opinion which for a while prevailed. We never doubted the decisive character of the final action of the House, when disenthralled of those extraneous considerations which, despite of a better judgment, sometimes obtrude themselves.

1. Resolved, That this commonwealth only has the right to control or interfere with the subject of domestic slavery, within its limits, and that these rights will be maintained at all hazards.—Unanimous.

2. Resolved, That the state of Virginia has a right to claim prompt and efficient legislation by her co-states, to restrain, as far as practicable, and to punish those of their citizens who, in defiance of the obligations of social duty and the constitution, assail her safety and tranquility, by forming associations for the abolition of slavery, or printing, publishing or circulating through the mail or otherwise, seditious and incendiary publications, and that this right, founded as it is on the principles of international law, is peculiarly fortified by a just consideration of the intimate and sacred relations that exist between the states of this Union.—Ayes, 108, noes, 7.

3. Resolved, That the non-slaveholding states of the union are respectfully, but earnestly requested promptly to adopt penal enactments, or such other measures as will effectually suppress all associations within their respective limits, purporting to be or having the character of abolition societies; and that they will make it penal to print, publish or distribute newspapers, pamphlets, or other publications calculated or having a tendency to excite the slaves of the southern states to insurrection and revolt.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

4. Resolved, That this General Assembly would regard any act of Congress, having for its object the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or the territories of the United States, as having just cause of alarm to the slaveholding states, and bringing the union into imminent peril.—Ayes 122; noes 4.

5. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

6. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be complied with in the spirit in which they are made, and completed with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

7. Resolved, That Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories of the United States.—Ayes 105; noes 13.

8. Resolved, That the Governor be, and he is hereby requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to the executive of each of the states of the union, with a request that the same may be submitted to their respective legislatures.

How Mobs are got up.

A SCENE IN A STABLE IN THE CITY OF —.

THOMAS P. with a number of his companions.

Thomas P.—I had quite a conversation with Esq. —. He was wonderfully friendly. I was surprised at it for this is the first time he ever took any notice of me. After a few kind inquiries about myself and business, he asked me what I thought of these noisy abolitionists. I told him I had no thoughts about them. I had never troubled my head to enquire who they were or what they wanted. Well, said he, they are an impertinent, meddling set, who are all the time scolding and fretting about what's none of their business—*Slavery at the South*. I fear they'll get themselves into difficulty. *I hate slavery*, I answered—So do I, said the squire. *I am as much opposed to it as any one*. But then I am more opposed to letting the negroes all loose. They are not fit to be free. They are so ignorant that they cannot tell a man from an ass. Let them free, Thomas, and they'd cut their masters' throats and then come in swarms to the north. How would you like that? Now this is just what the abolitionists are trying for. If they don't stop, I fear they'll get into trouble. Besides, Thomas, the south has got so mad now that they threaten to break friendship with us. And then away goes the glorious union, which has cost so much blood and treasure. And then what should we do for cotton and tobacco? Starvation must await us. The south too would get up an army of negroes, who will die for their masters any day, and come to the north. Then should we be deluged in blood. This is what the abolitionists are wanting. I more and more fear, they will bring the hand of violence upon themselves.

One of the worst things against the abolitionists is their determination to mix up white and black blood, by making us all, and especially the lower orders, whether they will or no, *internary with the negroes*. This is the first article in the constitution of their societies. They mean to hang or burn every man who will not take a black wife, and strange any woman who will not receive a black husband.

My fears increase that the mob will be out against them.

We have given them notice, that if they go on to have their meeting, we cannot protect them from the just indignation of an outraged public. Nobody can tell to what length the people once excited, will go. They have been kindling a fire, and it is no more than right to roast them first. If their houses are torn down and themselves tarred and feathered, we cannot help it. They should have done as we bid them. I shudder with fear, that nothing can save them from violence. Don't you think that they greatly expose themselves to the fury of a mob? Thomas, I wish, said the squire, very smilingly, you would talk this matter over with some of your friends, and see what can be done. I should not wonder if we had a mob. Something should be done to put down the abolitionists. I then made a low bow, and went off. Now, say boys, what had we better do? We can at least have a good scrap; and I think the squire will keep the law from hurting us. I care nothing, as I know nothing about the abolitionists. They never hurt me. But what say you to a scrape!—*Albany Standard and Democrat.*

Presentments.

The following presentments have been made by the grand jury of Frederick county, Va:—

"We, the grand jury, duly summoned to attend the circuit superior court of law and chancery, held for the county of Frederick, and duly empanelled, sworn, affirmed and charged, on this 3d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1835, in solemn form, present the *Abolition Society of New York*, and each member thereof, and especially ARTHUR TAPPAN, who is considered the prime mover and organizer of the said society, which we consider an evil of great magnitude, tending to disturb our peace and to excite insurrection among our slaves, injur-

ing the right of property guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, and endangering the lives of our citizens; and we do earnestly recommend to all judges and magistrates, and the police of every city, town, and corporation, to use unceasing vigilance and increased energy in the detection of all fanatical emissaries, and in the suppression of their nefarious schemes and publications; and we do moreover respectfully request the legislature existing laws against writing or printing books, pamphlets, or other writings, advising or encouraging insurrection, and the circulation of all such documents, and to enact such farther laws on the subject, with increased penalties, as shall more effectually suppress the circulation of all such incendiary matter, and to provide means for carrying all such laws into effect, by giving suitable rewards for the detection and apprehension of offenders.

JAMES G. FICKLIN, Foreman.
A copy—Teste, J. KEAN, Clk."

"We, the grand jury, duly summoned to attend the circuit court of law and chancery held for the county of Frederick, and duly empanelled, sworn, affirmed, and charged, on this 3d day of November, 1835, in solemn form present the free population of the commonwealth as a nuisance; and we do respectfully call upon the legislature for some decisive action upon this subject, such as may facilitate their removal out of the country by such ways and means as shall comport with humanity, safety, and the public weal.

JAMES G. FICKLIN, Foreman.
A copy—Teste, J. KEAN, Clk."

"We, the grand jury, being deeply impressed with the state of things around us, cannot close our session without reminding all officers of the peace, magistrates and others, of the great necessity that exists, by reason of the combined efforts of the abolition societies of the north, in disseminating their incendiary publications among us, and do most earnestly request of all such officers diligently to enforce the various acts of the legislature passed in reference to free negroes and slaves of this commonwealth; and we do also farther urge them hereafter to order out patrols in the different sections of the country, to insure in these critical times the peace and safety of the good people of the country.

JAMES G. FICKLIN, Foreman.
A copy—Teste, J. KEAN, Clk."

Monstrous Doctrine.

It is no new thing to be told, that selfish motives of gain will sometimes lead men to make strange avowals; but who, in enlightened, free America, in the 19th century, could have even dreamed, that there existed throughout the wide extent of its territory, an individual, who could think, much less avow, a proposition so utterly at variance with every preconceived idea of right—with every sentiment of humanity and every principle of justice, that the blood recoils upon the heart, and the mind starts back with horror at the mere thought. A man may risk his life upon the ocean—he may fix his dwelling place in a tropical climate, where the air is charged with the material of disease, and all for the sake of gain. He may go to the tented field to win the laurel wreath of war—all this has been done and done a thousand times; but what American citizen, will it be believed, would in a public meeting, so terribly outrage humanity, and this too, for the sake of gain, as to go back to the days of ancient Egypt, in search of some remedy to prevent the natural increase of a race of human beings, whose only crime so far has been, that they have been enslaved by superior physical power!

At a public meeting, held at Cincinnati on the 23d ult. agreeable to public notice, of all those friendly to perpetuating the system of domestic slavery, the mayor of the city was called to the chair, assisted by three Vice-Presidents, viz: Judge Burke, Judge Burnett, and Judge Torrence. A committee to prepare a series of resolutions, was appointed, and in the course of the evening several gentlemen addressed the meeting. Judge Wright was followed by Mr. Lytle, an ex-member of Congress. The latter part of this gentleman's speech is reported as follows—and if any error has occurred through inadvertence, which we have no reason to suppose, we shall feel it a duty to Mr. L. to place the matter immediately in a proper point of view. We hope, however, for the honor of human nature, there may have been some misunderstanding.

Alluding to a plan for elevating the condition of the African race:—"There was but one process," said Mr. Lytle, "by which it could be done—that was by expelling the black blood from the race. And this plan could be carried out in no other way, than by performing on the black males a surgical operation. If, too, there should be at any time a superabundance of slaves, so that they would be dangerous from their numbers; or if a diminution of the stock should be desirable on any account—the same operation on the black males, with a corresponding one on the black females, would insure, to any extent, the accomplishment of southern wishes and the security of our southern friends."—*Phila. Eve. Star.*

Washington's Opinions of Slavery.

The annexed extracts of letters, written by General Washington, may be found in the 9th volume of Sparks' edition, just published.

April 12, 1786.

TO ROBERT MORRIS:—

"I hope that it will not be conceived, from these observations, that it is my wish to hold the unhappy people who are the subject of this letter, in slavery. I can only say that there is not a man living, who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it; but there is only one proper and effectual mode by which it can be accomplished, and that is by legislative authority; and this, as far as my suffrage will go, shall never be wanting."

May 10, 1786.

TO THE MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE:—

"The benevolence of your heart, my dear Marquis, is so conspicuous on all occasions, that I never wonder at any fresh proofs of it; but your late purchase of an estate in the colony of Cayenne, with a view of emancipating the slaves on it, is a generous and noble proof of your humanity. Would to God a like spirit might diffuse itself generally into the minds of the people of this country. But I despair of seeing it. Some petitions were presented to the Assembly, at its last session, for the abolition of slavery; but they could scarcely obtain a reading. To set the slaves at large at once would, I really believe, be productive of much inconvenience and mischief, but by degrees it certainly might and assuredly ought to be effected; and that too by legislative authority."

Sept. 9, 1786.

TO JOHN F. MERCER:—

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted, by which slavery in this country may be abolished by law."

The Right of Property.

The southern members of Congress assert that the body has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.—Why? Because in the act of cession on the part of Virginia, as they say, it was made a condition that Congress should not disturb private property. The slaves, say these legislators, are *private property!*

Now, we hold that Congress should not disturb that which it should protect the right of *private property*. Having exclusive legislation over the Dis-

trict of Columbia, it should see that every person therein enjoys the *right of property*. This is the very reason why Congress should abolish slavery. The right of property is sacred. It belongs to every man. It was not given us by government; and it cannot, justly, be taken away by government. No compact, which takes away this right, can, so far as it does so, be of any binding force. Now, shall Congress continue to deprive one-fifth part of the people of the District of their property, because Virginia and Maryland did so before?—No. Congress is bound immediately to protect every person in the district, in the enjoyment of every thing that is his. The very slaveholders themselves confess, that it would be *right* for the slaves, if they had the power, to march into the capitol, sword in hand, and compel Congress to legislate their freedom. Is it right then for Congress to perpetuate slavery, merely because the slaves have not the power to enforce their just claim to freedom?

The right of property and the right of petition are alike with the slaveholders. They are very jealous guardians of the *right of property*, by which they mean their right to take and keep other people's property. And they no less watchfully guard the sacred right of petition, for they would utterly reject all petitions which pray for the restoration of property to its true owners!—*Human Rights.*

Religious Instruction of Slaves in South Carolina.

The following statements relating to the religious condition of slaves in South Carolina, has been sent us by the Rev. R. W. Bailey of Cheraw in that state.

In addition to some statistics already furnished, in a previous letter, on the religious improvement of the slaves, I am now able, from authentic information, to say, that of the five hundred and eighty thousand, which compose the entire population of this state, about eighty-seven thousand are members in the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian churches. Of these communicants more than forty thousand are slaves. The whole slave population is 315,000. It is easily seen, therefore, that of the white population about one-ninth and of the slave population about one-seventh are church members. It is proper these facts should come into the estimate of the religious condition and prospects of our slaves. In New England there are twenty thousand, and in the free states a hundred and twenty thousand blacks. I should be glad to see a comparison of their religious condition with that of our slaves in this one item. Do you believe that in New England as here, there is a larger proportion of black than white communicants? And what is doing there to improve the moral condition of the blacks?

The religious denominations, which embrace these forty thousand black members, are engaged earnestly, if not to the extent of their ability, to bring the saving blessings of the Gospel to the souls of all these "heathen among brethren." And are you not ready to say:—"Go on, brethren, and may God bless you."—We would rejoice to help you if we could; but if we cannot help you, we will "LET YOU ALONE!"—*N. Y. Observer.*

Cincinnati Anti-Abolition Meeting—Aboard.

The laboring people of Ohio had better ask themselves where will be the end of this making railroads over the freedom of speech and the cause of equal rights. The senators of South Carolina begin to lament that the African slave trade has been declared piracy. The home market is too dear. They are for free trade and no monopolies. The railroad may be done just in time to take off the cargoes of foreign slave-ships, and Ohio may be both physically and morally ready to admit the curse to her bosom. But if this should not take place, one thing is certain. The south holds the doctrine that one part of mankind always live on the labor of the other part, and that among the best modes of coming at this result, SLAVERY is one of the best. Now the Judge Wrights and the Hon. Robert Lytles of Ohio, appear to be already inoculated with this poison, and only need a little more intimate communion with the Calhouns and McDuffies of Charleston to make the disease flourish gloriously. Then the "operatives" of Ohio will enjoy the blessed privilege of being owned and "provided for." *Nimium ne crede color!* The hue of the skin is an unsafe bulwark for liberty. What odds in the world does it make with the planter, whether his cotton is forced out of white slaves or black! The slaveholders, justly fearing that as popular prejudices now stand, their slaves will soon be whitened into liberty, are at work to extend the principle of slavery to all complexions. When they have done it, the white children of Ohio, may be whirled over this rail-road to take the chance of the Charleston market. This is the consummation of southern policy, and every such meeting as that in Cincinnati—unless God, as he has done, overrule—helps it on.—*Emancipator.*

Right and Just.

The county court, at their late extra session, have granted licenses to all free negroes of good character to reside in the county. This result, we are informed, is owing principally to the humane and praiseworthy efforts of F. W. Risque, Esq.

In an argument before the court, he maintained with much force of eloquence, and succeeded in showing to the satisfaction of the court, that the provisions of the law of the late general assembly, under which it was proposed to exclude them from a residence in the county, were, both by the constitution of the United States, and by that of Missouri, unconstitutional.

Sincerely do we hope that the conduct of the free blacks will be such as not to disappoint the good wishes of those benevolent individuals—we now refer to many of our most respectable citizens—who have in their hour of need interposed in their behalf.—*St. Louis Obs.*

An Anti-Slavery Pudding.

An abolition lady, who has experience in such matters, has given us the following manipulations for a pudding, which we heartily recommend to all who profess to be the friends of HUMAN RIGHTS.

Take one quart of new milk, and stir into it a white boiling pint of yellow Indian meal, and a half pint of FREE LABOR molasses—take it off immediately. Then put into the pan in which the pudding is to be baked about a pint of sour cream or good buttermilk, and stir into it well a tea-spoonful of cold water, in which an even tea-spoonful of *Sal-aratus* has been perfectly dissolved. Then pour in and stir briskly the aforesaid mixture, (of hot milk, meal, and free labor molasses,) and put the pudding into the oven WITHOUT DELAY.

N. B. This pudding cannot be bettered by eggs or spice—and it does not need to be.—*Hum. Rights.*

Right to Petition.

THE course pursued by a portion of the southern members of Congress, in relation to petitions for the abolishment of slavery in the District of Columbia, is furnishing fuel for the abolitionists, and will magnify the evil which they profess to deprecate. The south ought to have been satisfied with the strong and spontaneous expression of popular sentiment, in the north and east, against the principles and conduct of the abolitionists. In asking more, they are in great danger of obtaining less. The RIGHT OF PETITION will never be surrendered. The attempt to usurp this right will arouse thousands who were sincerely desirous to avoid agitation in relation to slavery.—*Aurora.*

He that is angry with the just reprover, kindles the fire of the just revenger.—*Quarles.*

POETRY.

The African Slave.

ADDRESSING HIS UNFEELING MASTER AT THE TIME OF LEAVING HIS NATIVE COUNTRY.

Bind fast these hands—these feet confine;
Tell me I am not free;
From kindred, country, all that's mine,
Transport me o'er the sea;
In yonder mart of trafficking,
Where beasts are bought and sold,
There sell me, a poor African—
There barter me for gold!

Degrade me to the stupid beast,
That knows no right or wrong;
To man, though classed among the least,
Deny that I belong;
Say that I have no heart but steel—
No free born rights to loose—
No soul, my injured wounds to feel—
No better part to choose.

Do this, and then to church repair!—
Assume the Christian name;
And to thy God prefer thy prayer,
Devoid of fear or shame;
Reach forth thy hand to take the cup,
Salvation hath enjoin'd;
Like Judas! with the Saviour sup,
With an unhallo'd mind!

But know, thy God was never known,—
The God of peace and love;
He never can thy spirit own
In the blest courts above.
Thy god is this world's sordid gain,
And soon will leave thee drear;
When rack'd with some distracting pain,
Thou shalt not find Hix near.

There is a day approaching fast,
(It lies beyond the grave,)—
When righteous judgment will be pass'd
On tyrant and on slave;
To him who hath no mercy known,
No mercy will be given;
While he who hath kind pity shown,
Shall find a place in heaven.

I bow, since thou wilt not repent—
Nor longer for me wait;
Since thy stern heart cannot relent,
I yield me to my fate;
In distant lands, unknown to me,
Without one pitying friend,
Drugged out in abject slavery,
My wretched life shall end.

When each long sultry day is past,
My weary task to close,
And dew-drops gently falling fast,
Invite me to repose;
I'll hie me to some lonely spot,
Where footsteps ne'er have trod,
And there, by all mankind forgot,
Will raise my soul to God.

I may not, shall not be denied
The soul-sustaining grace
Of Him who hath on Calvary died,
For all the human race.
I'll in that lone, sequestered shade,
Pour forth that briny flood
To Him who hath in wisdom made
"All nations of one blood."—*Liberator.*

ANTI-SLAVERY INTELLIGENCE.

The West Indies.

It is certainly a cheering thing to the philanthropist and Christian, to see how God, in his providence, blesses the performance of duty. This is beginning to be remarkably demonstrated in the West Indies, as will be seen by the following articles from the New York Evangelist. We entertain no doubt that the same result, though in a much greater degree, would be witnessed in the southern states if they would obey the mandate—"let the oppressed go free."

In addition to the cheering article in another column, we have the testimony of an esteemed friend, an intelligent merchant in New England, at this moment sitting by our table, and who has just returned from a residence of fifteen months in the West Indies, and who assures us that the anticipations of the friends of freedom have been more than realized, and all the foreboding of the pro-slavery party are now laughed at.

LATEST FROM THE WEST INDIES.—An observing correspondent of the Journal of Commerce has visited several of the Islands where slavery was abolished on the first of August, 1834, and his report is more favorable than any previous account. In BARBADOES, he says, after a residence of three months, "that there is, since August, 1834, an appreciation of real estate; that the quantity of the crop is equal, and the cost and trouble of working estates is not increased."

From ANTIGUA, the report is still more favorable, as will be seen by the letter.

Antigua, 10th Jan. 1836.

We arrived at this charming island a day or two since. Its harbor, or St. John's harbor, is safe when once in it, but rather difficult of access. We could not but remark how superior this seemed in verdure and in culture to the other islands where we have touched. The legislature of this colony, instead of accepting the apprenticeship system as was done in the other dependencies, set the slaves free altogether. Of course we felt much solicitude to know how their plan worked. What we saw with our own eyes was highly favorable. The testimony of the inhabitants accorded with it. By their account, there was no difficulty in procuring labor at one shilling sterling per day and most persons think this cheaper than slave labor. One of the criteria is the price of property, and I was informed that real estate is changing hands briskly at an advance on former rates.

A clergyman connected with the army remarked to me that it was pretty generally conceded, that the holders here, was an equivalent to a free gift; the value of the property not being diminished. I have met with but one gentleman, and he was a member of the council for Trinidad, who did not admit that property was rising in value from some cause or other. Some attributes to the abundance of money in consequence of losses to the colonies and the compensation fund; others, to the high price of the colonial produce; and others to the new system, or all combined. I will not pretend to theorize on this subject. I give the facts as they appear after eighteen months experience. I have always been opposed to the schemes of abolitionists in our country, and still think the acts of the British government, gross violations of contracts; yet I trust that wherever truth leads, I shall be willing to follow. Certain facts I consider established.

1st. That labor can be obtained at reasonable rates.

I infer this from the fact that the desire of the comforts and necessities of life induces the colored people to seek employment, and that when task-work is given them it is performed cheaper under the free than under the slave system.

2d. That in view of the apprenticeship system properties have appreciated. Many speculators have considered estates here good and safe investments.

The sugar crop throughout the ten islands where we have been is remarkably promising. In the French islands a desire was expressed that war might take place with us, with the expectation, I suppose, that their ports would see some rich prizes. The French Admiral, with one ship of war, has arrived at Guadalupe.

NORTHERN SPIRIT.

Public Sentiment—Cincinnati Resolutions.

PRO-SLAVERY MEETING.—A meeting has been held in Cincinnati of those opposed to anti-slavery measures, which on account of the principles advanced and the standing and character of the men who took a leading part in its proceedings and deliberations, deserves more than a passing notice. When such men as Jacob Burnett, John C. Wright, Robert T. Lytle and others, lend the sanction of their names and influence to principles, like those contained in resolutions passed at this meeting, principles utterly subversive of the rights of men and totally at war with the genius of our government, it is time for the people to begin to search into the cause of the evil which is so fast driving from them the fundamental principles of liberty, and lay to their united efforts, that this cause may be removed, before utter ruin shall overtake them.

The first resolution passed at this meeting which we shall notice, is the following:

"Resolved, That we coincide fully, in the enlightened views taken by the governor of New York in his late message, on this subject, and believe with him, that if in defiance of the well known established popular sentiment, to sustain in its purity the integrity of the federal compact, these 'misguided men' continue to pursue a course, at war with the same, that we will join in recommending the prompt and efficient legislation of this state, in conjunction with the other members of the confederacy, to arrest their designs, and thereby sustain the original compact, which made us a united people."

Here then is a plain declaration, that if the friends of the slave at the north, "continue" to proclaim the doctrines contained in the Declaration of our Independence "that all men are born free and equal," &c.; if they "continue" to maintain, that men ought to cease from doing unto others as they would not be done unto; if they "continue" to declare that to rob a man of himself, his wife and children, and all the fruits of his daily labor is a heinous sin against God and a violation of his most sacred commandments; if they "continue" to serve God according to the dictates of their own consciences and his word by reproving sin, and endeavoring to persuade men to turn from their evil ways and pursue righteousness; if they "continue" to do these things by the fearless exercise of the rights bestowed upon them by their Maker and secured to them by the constitution under which they live, then the arm of the law is to be upraised to sweep away their rights with the besom of destruction, and reduce them to the condition of slaves that the chains which now bind more than two millions of our fellow creatures in this land where naught but freedom dwells, may be drawn with a more gallant effort around those already ground into the dust by their iron hearted oppressors! It never can, it never will be done! Selfish politicians, may join in recommending, but no legislature, will be found sufficiently depraved to lay the constitution prostrate and bleeding before them and take away the rights of their constituents for the purpose of perpetuating slavery. And even should this be done, it would raise a commotion, which would shake society to its centre. The freemen of the north, would begin to flock around the standard of liberty. They would guard the citadel of their rights, and would not fail to hold slavery responsible as the enemy which had made an assault upon the sanctuary of their dearest idol, and never would lay off their armor until with a high hand and a strong arm they had placed their foot upon the neck of their foe and slain the greatest depredator upon human rights.

But this is not the only, exceptionable resolution passed at this meeting. The following proclaims, fully, the doctrine that men who have a colored skin are subjects for property. That the slaveholder has a right of property in his slave. Which right is not created by the law, but a previously existing right merely secured to them by the constitution and laws of the land.

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, it is not expedient for Congress to adopt a course of legislation for the District of Columbia by which the citizens thereof will be deprived of the right of property in their slaves, which right we believe is secured to them by the constitution and laws of the land."

Here then it is plainly asserted, that the slaveholders in the District of Columbia have a right of property in their slaves. That that right is secured to them by the constitution and laws of the United States, and that it is inexpedient for Congress to deprive them of that right. There is a great inconsistency in this resolution. If it be true that this right is secured to the citizens of the District of Columbia by the constitution, then Congress has no right to abolish slavery in the District; and why say "it is not expedient?" Why not come out boldly and say that it has not the right to do it. The reason is obvious. Nine-tenths of the people at the north believe that Congress have the right to abolish slavery in the District, and the politicians who were the leaders of this meeting, would not hazard their standing by denying that right, but content themselves by declaring it inexpedient to use it, at the same time endeavoring to satisfy the south by declaring that slavery is guaranteed by the constitution. Now we would be glad to be informed in what clause of the constitution of the United States, the right to hold property in slavery is secured to the citizens of the District of Columbia. There is no such clause. No such security is given. The constitution of the United States is a plain instrument. The people can read it and judge for themselves.

We will notice only one more resolution. It is what may be called the mob-exciting and mob-pleasing resolution evidently inserted as a scare-crow to those who are endeavoring to spread the blessings of freedom. These men are not to be deterred by threats of danger.

It is strange that northern men should endeavor to blind the eyes of the people of the south by such false representations in regard to the number of those engaged in anti-slavery measures. The time has gone by when their number was insignificant. Thousands are now acting with them, and their number is daily increasing.

"Resolved, That fully impressed as we are with the insignificance, as regards numbers, of the abolitionists of the west, and aware of the excited and provoked feelings of the great mass of our fellow-citizens opposed to our views, we consider it our duty to warn these deluded men, of the odium they are incurring, in persevering in their weak and vain struggles for an object impracticable and unattainable."—*Ohio Atlas.*

Beaver County, Pa., Anti-Slavery Meeting.

RESOLVED, That the right of free discussion is the birthright of man—guaranteed to every American citizen, by the constitution of his country—consequently, it cannot be taken from him, or abridged by any power whatsoever.

Resolved, That as the U. S. mail and post-office

were established for the good of the whole nation, therefore, the abolitionists have the same right as any other body of men to the use of it. If they violate their rights, let them be dealt with according to law, but let the right remain sacred.

Resolved, That every man who joins a mob is a traitor to his country, and by so doing lends his influence to the introduction of anarchy and the demolition of our federal constitution.

Resolved, That slaveholders are agitators, and their doctrines incendiary, producing mobs, lawless violence, destruction of property by fire, judgment and death, without trial by jury—insecurity and alarm, by offering rewards for the abduction of American citizens who have broken no law, and are convicted of no crime.

Resolved, That the charges made against abolitionists by the president of the U. States, and governors of different states, are entirely unsupported by evidence; consequently we look upon the abolitionists as an innocent, injured and persecuted class of citizens, and feel called upon to aid in maintaining their rights, and vindicating their character before the nations and the world.

Resolved, That as liberty and slavery cannot exist in the same country, under the same laws, without the destruction of the one or the other—we therefore feel called upon as friends of liberty, to give our united testimony in her favor, and also to embody our influence against oppression, by forming an Anti-Slavery Society.

After the above resolutions were adopted, the following preamble to a constitution was presented and accepted, and the officers elected for the ensuing year.

PREAMBLE.

Whereas, In the principles of liberty are freedom and equality of rights—and as color, condition of birth, poverty, ignorance, deformity, or any other peculiarity or misfortune, cannot affect these rights, we therefore regard it not only as a glaring inconsistency, but a flagrant violation of justice, for republicans to seize those whom Providence has so circumstanced as to render unable to defend themselves or protect their families, and strip them of their all—drag them down to the mean level of a chattel—turning them into articles of merchandise, or mere tools to be used for the convenience of the master, thus striking them out of existence as beings possessing rights and susceptibilities of happiness."

We raise our voice against this crying injustice, and strive to obey the command, "thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him."

Further—the tone assumed on this subject by the wrong-doers is fearfully portentous, and demands the immediate rebuke of freemen. When remonstrated with, and asked by what right they hold these men as property? They "point to their swords and scorn any other reply." We may be the sufferers next, and this summary logic silence our demands for justice. Believing then, as we do, that slavery is the foster-mother of oppression, and the most ferocious enemy of civil liberty, we will use our influence to bring about its speedy abolition.

MISCELLANEOUS.

"Southern Chivalry."

By nothing have the free states been more befooled than the notion of "southern chivalry." Multitudes are persuaded, that a southern climate and habits of slave-domination have a marvellous efficacy in converting all who have the good fortune to be exposed to their salutary influence, into Crichtons, and Bayards, and Orlando's. Such, reason altogether unphilosophically, and the facts show it. Whilst many of the planters, of age, sobriety and standing, entertain right views as to the chivalry prevailing there, it is very certain, that with the young, the idle, the dissipated and the politically ambitious, it is excessive.

The morbid sensibility prevailing in slave states—and proportioned, too, pretty accurately, to the aggravation of slavery—is actually astonishing. An instance of it: Three years ago, the firm of — in New Orleans, had two young men in their employment as clerks. A gentleman, passing by the counting room, stepped in and enquired if the mail had arrived? One of the young men answered yes. The gentleman went on his way. The other clerk said without any intention, apparent in his manner, of insulting the first, that, the mail had not arrived. This produced a re-affirmation on the other part. Mutual contradictions grew fierce—honour was wounded—and southern chivalry called the young men (for they were quite young) to the field. At the first discharge of pistols, one of them was wounded very badly in the ankle. His uncle, who was one of the firm, examined the wound to see if his nephew could stand up to renew the fight; declaring he should fight on, if he could stand. However, the young man was too much disabled and the affair ended here.

Both members of the firm, by which these young men were employed—men of age, and of respectable character, according to the New Orleans standard, were present, one on each side, urging on this disgraceful and vile work.

Of all sorts of chivalry, whether of the dark ages or of present times, we have entertained for many years a very poor opinion—because they were opposed to common sense and religion. But that, which publishes its recommendations in lawless violence on defenceless strangers, in whippings, and executions, in the prostration of all law, in a determination to persist in oppression, and in preying on its own caste, in the absence of other nourishment, we hold an utter abhorrence. This is southern chivalry—and of its claim to favor we have in the following article, fresh and indubitable evidence.

Raymond, Miss. January 13, 1836.—The state of things in this community is very peculiar. Wealth, land, negroes and cotton bales, and politics form the grand and all-absorbing considerations; and hence, impetuosity and warmth of temperament are strikingly manifest among all ranks and conditions of men. A brother told me that at Vicksburg, on Christmas evening, he saw a man brought into the tavern dreadfully gashed and cut in a dirk fight he had; and that during the night, he heard the report of a pistol, and next morning a man was found in the street with a large ball and five buck shot holes in his breast. On Monday last, the streets of Clinton were unusually thronged with men, and on enquiry I was informed that two men were momentarily expected to meet and commence shooting at each other. During the evening one of them shot the other, but without doing any injury. Next morning I left soon after daylight, in the stage: when about one quarter of a mile out of town, I passed two parties just preparing for a duel, which soon after took place between Judge Caldwell and Mr. Gwinn, receiver of public monies. They were placed six yards from each other, and with four pistols each, and they approached and fired at each other at pleasure; six or seven shots passed—Caldwell had an arm shot to pieces, and another ball passed through his bowels, while Gwinn had a shot in his breast which bowed

directly through his body. Caldwell is dead, and Gwinn yet lingers. At the tavern where I stayed on Monday night, in Clinton, one man, on undressing exhibited eight pistols, and another six, besides a large knife, two inches broad and fifteen inches long. But enough of this.

CRUDITY.

THE following essay taken from the Cincinnati Gazette, occasioned us a little doubt, at the first reading;—we scarcely knew whether the writer intended it in earnest or in joke. Another gentleman, we know, has put it down for the latter. However, there is in it, to our view, too much of the sincerity and simplicity of ignorance for this construction to be put on it. However, be this as it may, —if it is intended for irony, the intention is too deeply hidden; if for good earnest, it well deserves the head to which we have attached it.

Mr. Hammond—I perceive in your paper of Thursday, an article upon slavery, copied from a New York paper, which I hope will prove a warning to the abolitionists, inasmuch as it shows an increase of the slave business since their ill-directed efforts commenced, and, evidently, in consequence of those efforts. Every new proceeding of the abolitionists is set down, not in black and white, but in black, blue, and red, upon the back of the slave. And here, I suppose, those who are the cause of it, will exclaim at what they are pleased to call the barbarity of the master, when it is but an act of necessity, to save his slaves from murdering him and his family; severe, it is true, but still necessary, and made so by these very abolitionists, who pretend to be the friends of the slave. I repeat, they make it necessary; for every meeting they hold on the subject, every pamphlet they print, makes the slave more restless and troublesome; which evils must, of course, be put down. If the slaves are let alone as they are, and no more attempts made to free them, it will be much to their advantage; they will lose all thoughts of rising up against their masters; their masters would become kind and indulgent, and the lot of the slave in this country would be nearly as comfortable as the lower class of people, even in the United States, and fully as much so as those of the old countries. Witness the condition of the foreigners who are every day arriving on our shores—look at them, and then at the slave in the south; half these emigrants do not know where their next mouthful of bread is to come from, or when; the slave has no such fear; he looks forward with happiness to the close of the day, and has no cares for the morrow; he is satisfied with his food and clothing, which are better than he could provide if he were free; and, as they look up to the white man as a superior being, (and surely he is,) it is only when they hear of some meeting of those superior beings at which the miseries of the "poor slave are discussed," that they are in the least dissatisfied.

Some persons have proposed to educate the slave. This will never do—it will not free them, and consequently can only make them more miserable than the abolitionists are in a fair way to make them. At present they know nothing about the rights of man, and all that, and are therefore more contented than they would be if they did. "Where ignorance is happiness, it is fully to be wished."

In fact, the inferiority of the African negro almost makes one lean to the belief of some, that he was intended to be a slave. At any rate, he has need of somebody to take care of him; and while he gets a master who makes him as comfortable as the lower classes of the whites in the largest part of the world, he certainly has no cause to complain. The slave, if he obeys his master, receives chastisement—a few blows only; over in the old countries, if a poor man does contrary to the wish of his lord, he does not receive a whipping, it is true, but he is tumbled heels over head out of his house, with his whole family, to perish. Which is the worst?

And if the abolitionists wish to ease the lot of the slave, let them go to the master, and talk to him about setting his slaves free. Oh no—they know better than that—they keep out of the way themselves, but send pictures calculated to inflame the slave, where he can see them—and he becomes irritated to kill his master, and, as many more of the whites as he can. Pretty times, indeed, when white people have more feeling for blacks—scarcely brings that are human—than they have for people of their own color, and of their own country!

Which had better be, the negro a slave, with some little trouble, or that the white men be murdered, and six millions of whites have to suffer? Shall three millions of negroes be the cause of the dissolution of this union? Such will, certainly, be the consequence of the mode at present pursued by the abolitionists.

And now, sir, I am done, but I wish it to be understood—distinctly understood—that I do not consider you responsible for anything that I have advanced.

DELICATE REBUKE.

From Zion's Herald, a Methodist Paper.

THE WESTERN METHODIST.—This we have always considered one of the best religious publications of the age. It is filled with a variety of most interesting and valuable matter, and we presume—judging from its value—has a very extensive circulation.

With these feelings of respect, it was with deep regret we read the following moderate note, by Mr. Speight, member of Congress, introduced with the word "Good!"

"I herewith return you your protest, enclosing, as a testimony of my high regard for your necks, a piece of rope. You will, no doubt, duly appreciate my motives."

Washington, January 2, 1836.

Now, did our brethren really mean, that such a thing was really good? We in charity think it was an oversight. If not, we sincerely hope, for the sake of the church, whose honor is the apple of our eye—for the sake of the Bible—for the sake of HUMANITY—for the sake of the LAW—they will take the name of "METHODIST" from their paper and substitute some other, more indicative of its true character.

[We must commit to the same paper, for its christian admonition, J. N. Maffit, a Methodist minister, and the editor of the Mississippi Christian Herald, published at Natchez; who, as we are informed by the Liberator, proclaims, in recommending his paper to the public, that "IT WILL RECOGNIZE THE RIGHT OF MAN TO HOLD PROPERTY IN MAN." Would it not be well for Mr. Maffit to attempt the cure of his countryman, O'Connell, of his liberty-fever, by persuading him to come over, and advertise for popularity in the south? One would suppose that such men as Mr. M. and Bishop England of South Carolina had witnessed enough of oppression and suffering in the land of their nativity, to prevent their lending aid to its support here.]—*Ed. Phil.*

LITERARY.

The Dying Slave.

"I WAS in the right mood for it, and gave full scope to my imagination."

He lay on a straw couch, with his face half turned towards the sinking sun. The skin was drawn tightly over his forehead, as though he was parched and shrunken by extreme age; but the restless and uneasy wanderings of his eye told that he still claimed some companionship with earthly feelings.

He was a slave; and for more than a hundred years he had gone forth to the daily toil of a bondman. It was said that in the "father land," from which he has been torn by unprincipled violence, he had been a prince among his people. In the first days of his slavery, he was fierce and ungovernable—nor could his haughty spirit be tamed into subjection until it had been subdued by gratitude. The father of his present master had in his childhood, by interfering to save him from punishment, received on his own body, the blows intended for the slave;—and from that moment he became to his youthful master a devoted servant. The child had arrived at maturity, flourished through his term of years, and faded away into the grave, but still the aged Afric lingered upon the earth; and it was for the son of that man that he now waited, and to use his own expression, "held his breath," until he should behold him.

At length the light of the low cabin door was darkened, as the master stooped his tall form to enter the dwelling of his slave. "I have come," said he, as he approached,—"what would you with me?"

The negro raised himself with a sudden energy, and stretched out his withered hand. "Have I not borne you in my arms in your helpless infancy," said he, "and should I not once more behold you before I die! Heed me, master! Ere you sun shall set, the last breath shall have passed my lips—its beams are fast growing aslant and yellow—tell me before I die if I have not served thee faithfully!"

"You have,"

"I have been honest and true—I have never spoken to you a lie—I have never deserved the lash!"

"To my knowledge, never," said the master.

"Then there is but one more boon I would crave of you;—I am going home,—to revisit the scenes of my youth—to mingle with the spirits of my friends!"

"Suffer me not to return to them a slave. My fathers were proud chieftains among my native wilds—they sought after the lion in the midst of his recesses—they subdued the savage tiger—they were conquerors in battle—they never bowed to man—they would spurn a bondman from their halls!" "Oh! tell me," said he, seizing his master's hand in the rising excitement of his feelings, "oh! tell me, while I may yet hear, that I may yet hear sound, that I am once more free!"

"Your wish is granted," said his master, "you are a freeman!"

"A freeman!" repeated the negro, slowly sinking back upon his couch, and clasping his hands above his head with all his remaining energy, "write it for me master!"

The gentleman tore a leaf out of his pocket-book, and penning a hasty certificate of his freedom, handed it to the slave. The old man lifted up his head once more as he received it, and the last ray of sun-light streamed across his countenance; as with a strange smile he gazed upon the paper, then falling suddenly back, he once more repeated the name of freedom, and expired!

Beautiful Trait in a Young Girl.

SOME time after the horrible massacre which signaled the commencement of the French revolution, the contagious example propagated murder and destruction, even in the new world. One cannot remember it without shuddering with horror, that, in order to put to death more quickly a multitude of men and women at once and without trial, they collected them in groups—then fired upon them from several cannons loaded with cannon shot.

An honest creole of St. Domingo, who had committed no other crime than that of preserving the heritage of his fathers, and of being rich, was in consequence inscribed upon the list of proscription; the wretches who decorated themselves with the name of patriots, in imbruing their hands in the blood of the most innocent citizens, denounced him as an enemy to the public welfare; and he was condemned to perish, together with a number of the unfortunate.

Happy for this old colonist, he was a father, above all, of a little daughter, full of courage, tenderness and energy. When he was dragged from the bosom of his family, his child resolutely followed him, and resolved to share his destinies, however dreadful they might be.

Placed one of the first among the victims whom they were going to sacrifice, already the creole had his eyes blindfolded and his arms tied; already the satellites of death awaited their murderous arms upon the unfortunate, deprived of hope and ready to die. O happiness! O sentiment! sacred of nature, what power is yours! You anticipate the years in uncommon persons whom you animate with your divine fire; you lend them the foresight of the wise and the strength of men in their infancy!

At the precise moment of the signal for the discharge of the artillery, a little girl comes running, crying, "My father, O my father!" Vainly they try to take her away from danger; vainly they threaten her—nothing stops her—nothing intimidates her. She rushes towards her father, she attaches herself to his body, which she presses closely with her little arms, and waits for the moment to perish with the author of her days.

"Oh, my daughter, dear child! only and sweet hope of thy weeping mother," said her father, trembling and melting into tears, "retire I entreat thee, I order thee." "O my father," responded the maiden, "O my father, let me die with you!"

Oh! what an empire has virtue over souls the most ferocious! This unexpected incident disconcerts the commander of the massacre. Without doubt he was a father also. The voice of admiration, the cry of pity, rose suddenly from his heart! He alleges a specious pretext for delivering the creole from death, and causes him to be reconducted to prison with his child. A moment of delay is sometimes precious.—The face of affairs having shortly changed, the good father was released; and since that day, he ceases not to relate with the tenderest emotion, the heroic action of his little daughter, aged then only ten years.

Lines.

WRITTEN BY THOMAS MOORE, ESQ., ON LEAVING AMERICA FOR HIS NATIVE LAND.

To think that man, thou just and gentle God,
Should stand before thee with a tyrant's rod
O'er creatures like himself, with souls from thee—
Yet dare to boast of perfect liberty!—
Away! away!—I'd rather hold my neck
By doubtful tenure from a Sultan's beck;
In climes where Liberty is scarcely named,
And naught but that of ruling ever claim'd;
Than thus to live, where Freedom waves
Her fustian flag, in mockery o'er slaves!

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Miami High School, for Colored Youth.

JOHN B. JOHNSON proposes opening a school in Logan County, Ohio, for the benefit of colored youth.

This Institution shall have for its object the elevation of the colored race; and shall combine in its plan of education, every advantage that can be derived from a punctual and conscientious care bestowed upon the pupils, in every branch of science—and from an uninterrupted attention which shall be given to the manners and moral principles of the youth.

The location is healthy and retired.
The branches to be taught are Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, English Grammar, Geography, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Mathematics, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, Latin and Greek Languages—Including a course of instruction which shall embrace all that is taught in the western colleges and academies.

The terms for boarding, lodging, books, stationary and tuition, including Reading, Writing, English Grammar, and Geography, \$120 per annum, in advance. From those within the state, six months in advance will be received. To those pursuing Classical Literature, there will be an additional charge of \$20, when books, &c., are furnished by the Institution.

The English department will be separate, and conducted by a separate teacher.
It is designed to connect with the Institution as soon as practicable, manual labor, principally in the mechanic arts.

The Institution shall be under the inspection of a board of Trustees; whose duty it shall be to report annually, in relation to the state and proceedings of the Institution, progress of the pupils, diligence of the teachers, &c.

The school will be expected to open about the first of June, 1836. Short semi-annual vacations may be expected.

Arrangements will be made as soon as practicable, for the instruction of females in those branches peculiar to a polite female education.

February 19, 1836.

Found.

By the subscribers, about the 15th January last, on the roof of their flat boat, one box, marked R. EDMONDS, containing a Saddle, Bridle and Martingale, supposed to have been left by a steam boat. The owner can have the above, by proving property, and paying the expense of advertising.

JAS. ATKINSON, & Co.

New Richmond, Ohio, Feb. 19, 1836.—3t.